REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 5-15 are pending in the present application, Claims 1, 5 and 7-9 are amended and Claims 10-15 are added by the present amendment. Support for additions and amendments to the claims can be found in the specification as originally filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Boyle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,158, herein "Boyle") in view of Milford et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 20030224781, herein "Milford") and Wolters et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0143982, herein "Wolters").

Turning now to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1 and 5-9 over Boyle, Milford and Wolters.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

> a first server for providing a first service to a first terminal via a network; and
> a second server for providing a second service to a second terminal via said network;
> wherein said first server includes:
> first providing means for providing said first service to said first terminal; and
> first transmitting means for transmitting provision information indicating that said first service has been provided by said first providing means to said second server; and
> said second server includes:
> detecting means for recognizing from said provision information, transmitted from said first transmitting means of said first server, that said first service has been provided to said first server and detecting said second service related to said first service;
> second transmitting means for transmitting recommendation information, for recommending said second service detected by said detecting means, to said first terminal;

Although of differing class and/or scope, independent Claims 5, 7, 8-10 and 14 recite similar features.

Boyle describes a system including a PC 110, a mobile phone 106 and a web server 112. As acknowledged on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, Boyle does not describe or suggest the second server recited in Claim 1.

However, the outstanding Action relies on Milford as curing the above noted deficiency of Boyle.

Milford describes a system including a plurality of media servers MS1-n and a service broker (SB).[1] The server broker (SB) of Milford provides an interface between user devices and the media servers. In other words the SB of Milford acts as a gateway or proxy for the media servers.

The outstanding Action of page 4, lines 13-15 that the service broker of Milford provides the functions of the second server recited in Claim 1.

Milford, however, does not describe or suggest that the second server includes a detecting means for recognizing from the provision information, transmitted from the first transmitting means of the first server, that the first service has been provided to the first server and *detecting the second service related to the first service*.

In other words, Claim 1 recites that the first and second severs cooperate with each other to provide a second service related to the first service to the first terminal. In contrast, Milford describes that the Service Broker matches user needs with available services.[2] Thus, Milford merely compares the available services with the needs of the user. Nowhere does Milford describe or suggest that two servers cooperate to enable a second server to determine a second service that is related to a first service provided by a first server.

---

[1] See Milford, fig. 4.
[2] Milford, paragraph 0044, lines 16-17.

Thus, it is clear that the Service Broker of <u>Milford</u> does not operate in the same stage as the media servers, and in fact, acts as a proxy/gateway for bundling the services provided by the media servers. Thus, <u>Milford</u> does not describe a second server that detects a second service related to a first service.

In addition, the further cited <u>Wolters</u> reference does not cure the above noted deficiencies in the combination of <u>Boyle</u> and <u>Milford</u>.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of <u>Boyle</u>, <u>Milford</u> and <u>Wolters</u> does not describe or suggest a second server that includes detecting means for recognizing from said provision information, transmitted from said first transmitting means of said first server, that said first service has been provided to said first server and detecting said second service related to said first service, as is recited in Claim 1.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and similarly Claims 5, 7, 8 and 9-15, and Claims depending therefrom, patentably distinguish over <u>Boyle</u>, <u>Milford</u> and <u>Wolters</u>.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
  (OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\JL\251901US\251901US_AM(8.6.2007).DOC

12